REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-14 presently stand

rejected. Claim 15 is added by way of this amendment to further define the invention as

discussed below.

Analysis of the Indefiniteness Rejections

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. With respect to

claim 11, the Examiner maintains the same rejection as the previous Office Action. In particular,

the Examiner does not understand how it is possible to precedently execute the writing process

after the print request is generated.

Applicants submit that claim 11 is directed to the second embodiment of the invention.

In the second embodiment, the priority of each task is rewritten according to a situation of the

processing of the task, rather than at a predetermined time (see pages 28-29 of originally filed

specification). Referring to Fig. 12, the process for changing the priority of a task is shown. In

particular, the number of unprocessed requests for printing is determined, and based on this

number of unprocessed requests, it is determined how to set the priority of the writing task. That

is, the writing task is set to a higher priority than the printing task when the number of requests

for printing exceeds a predetermined amount. This feature is recited in the last paragraph of

amended claim 11, "wherein said writing process is controlled so that it is precedently executed

by a CPU in case a stored quantity of said requests for printing generated by an execution of said

generation process by said CPU is equal to or more than a predetermined quantity."

Thus, in claim 11 there is more than one request for printing, and thus, it is possible to execute a writing process after one of the plurality of print requests has been generated.

With respect to claim 12, the Examiner indicates that it is unclear how it is possible to change the priority of a printing task and always have it be at the highest priority. As discussed at pages 20-21 of the specification, and illustrated in Fig. 9, the priority changing section prioritizes each of the tasks. Once a printing task is given the highest priority, it need not be re-prioritized again; however, after the printing task is completed and while another task is being executed, a new printing task event may occur. In such a case, the new printing task would be set at the highest priority in the priority table.

It is noted that a prior art rejection has still not been applied against claims 11-12; therefore, claims 11-12 should be indicated as containing patentable subject matter and allowed once the indefiniteness rejection is overcome.

Analysis of the Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shima et al. (EP 0782067 A2).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima et al. (EP 0782067 A2).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima et al. (EP 0782067 A2), and further in view of Zimmerman (5,490,237).

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima et al. (EP 0782067 A2) in view of newly cited Welland et al. (5,247,677).

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shima et al. (EP 0782067 A2) in view of newly cited Welland et al. (5,247,677).

Independent claim 1 is amended as indicated in the attached claims. In particular, claim 1 is amended along the lines discussed during the Examiner Interview of December 9, 2005. These claim amendments are believed to clarify the invention. Shima '067 fails to teach or suggest that the relative order of priority of the tasks is varied before such tasks are executed.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is distinguishable from Shima '067.

Claims 2-6, 8-9 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, by virtue of their dependency therefrom.

Independent claim 7 is still rejected as being anticipated by Shima '067. Shima '067 does not teach or suggest that a predetermined event could cause a change in the execution of the tasks. Shima '067 merely processes the tasks according to their assigned priorities, without providing for any manner to change the processing order of the tasks. Moreover, claim 7 is amended to clarify that the relative order of priority of the tasks is varied before the tasks are executed. Thus, claim 7 is distinguishable from Shima '067.

Independent claim 10 is patentable because Shima '067 fails to contemplate changing the priorities of tasks. Rather, the tasks are assigned priorities (col. 16, lines 26), and executed accordingly. Although the term "alternately" is used in line 27 of col. 16, there is no indication that this means that the order of the priorities is *reversed*. Rather, it means that each task alternates in turn, according to its priority. There is no support in any portion of Shima '067 to support an interpretation that the priorities of the writing process and the generation process are

10

reversed every predetermined time interval. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion for modifying Shima '067 to have this feature. Thus, claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Shima '067.

There are no prior art rejections cited against claims 11 and 12; therefore, these claims are presumed patentable once the indefiniteness rejections are withdrawn.

Claim 13 is amended along the lines of claims 1 and 7 in an effort to clarify the language in this claim. Claim 13 is now believed patentable because the relative order of priority of the tasks is varied before the tasks are executed. The combination of Shim and Welland fail to arrive at this feature.

Finally, Applicants add claim 15 to further define the invention. In particular, none of the cited prior art references teach or suggest that the priority of the tasks is *dynamically* varied.

In the prior art, the relative priority of the tasks is not varied. Their priority is predictable and known to be taken in their relative rotational order. This is completely different from the present invention wherein the priority of the tasks is dynamic. As stated at page 3 of the originally filed specification, the present invention includes "dynamically varying the priority".

For example, the present invention would improve upon the device of Shima '067 because instead of processing the tasks in their relative order of task 1, task 2, task 3, task 1, task 2, task 3, etc., the tasks would be processed according to a predetermined event. Thus, while the tasks may be initially ordered as task 1, task 2, task 3, task 1, task 2, etc, when a predetermined event occurs the relative order of the tasks would be changed, e.g. task 1, task 3, task 2, task 3, task 2, task 3, task 1. The "predetermined event" in the claims, is an event which would trigger a

change in the previously assigned priorities of the tasks. Shima '067 fails to teach or suggest any

of this, either explicitly or inherently. Shima '067 simply processes the tasks in their assigned

order, without any regard to varying their priorities upon the trigger of a predetermined event.

In view of the foregoing, claim 15 is patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 16, 2005

Ellen R. Smith
Registration No. 43,042

Attorney Docket No.: Q58164